



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,280	05/16/2001	Ralph C. Gray	1656A1	2673

7590 01/21/2003

PPG INDUSTRIES, INC.
Intellectual Property Department
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15272

EXAMINER

SELLERS, ROBERT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/858,280

Applicant(s)

GRAY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Sellers

Art Unit

1712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 1712

Based on the oral election of the invention of Group I, claims 1-15 by Jacques B. Miles set forth hereinbelow, the application has been transferred to Examiner Robert Sellers in Art Unit 1712 for examination of the composition claims. Due to the unfamiliarity of the previous examiner with the particular permutations of the epoxy resin composition art, the following additional election of species requirement is advanced hereinbelow with respect to elected claims 1-15.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-15, drawn to a composition comprising the reaction product of an epoxy polymer and a phosphorus acid groups-containing compound, a curing agent and an electroconductive pigment, classified in class 523, subclass 458.
- II. Claims 16-20, drawn to an aqueous composition comprising the reaction product of an epoxy polymer and a phosphorus acid groups-containing compound, a curing agent, an electroconductive pigment and water, classified in class 523, subclass 402.
- III. Claims 21-24, drawn to an organic solvent-based composition comprising the reaction product of an epoxy polymer and a phosphorus acid groups-containing compound, a curing agent, an electroconductive pigment and an organic solvent, classified in class 523, subclass 456.
- IV. Claims 25-28, drawn to a process for coating a continuous metal sheet, classified in class 427, subclass 407.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and (II or III) are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a adhesive formulation and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Invention II is distinct from Invention III since the water of Invention II is a materially different diluent from the organic solvent of Invention III since the water forms an emulsion of the components which is rheologically different from the dissolved components utilizing the organic solvent of Invention III.

Inventions (I or II or III) and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as a method of bonding two substrates.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Jacques B. Miles on November 22, 2002, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-15. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 16-28 are withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- 1) The epoxy resins such as the polyglycidyl ether of bisphenol A defined in claim 3.
- 2) The phosphorus acid groups-containing compounds such as either the phosphoric acid, phosphonic acid or phosphorous acid of claim 5.

- 3) The curing agents a.ii. such as the aminoplast of claim 9.
- 4) The electroconductive pigments such as either the zinc, aluminum, iron, graphite, diiron phosphide, tungsten or stainless steel of claim 10.
- 5) The presence or absence of the potassium tripolyphosphate of claim 18.
- 6) The presence or absence of the amine of claim 19.
- 7) The presence or absence of the corrosion inhibiting pigments of claim 20, wherein if their presence is elected, a further election of a particular species thereof from page 13, line 29 to page 14, line 5 of the specification.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species within each of items 1) to 7) hereinabove for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-15 are generic.

A reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1712

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The reply to this requirement to be complete must include elections of the species to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

(703) 308-2399 (Fax no. (703) 872-9310)
Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00 EST



Robert Sellers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

rs
1/17/03